



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

PPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
09/682,839	10/23/2001	Christophe Gourraud	P15282US1	9172		
27902 7:	27902 7590 07/15/2004			EXAMINER		
ERICSSON R	RESEARCH CANADA	PHILLIPS, HASSAN A				
0 . 0 0 2 2 0 1 11 11	QC H4P 2N2		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CANADA			2151			

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application No.		Applicant(s)			
			09/682,839			٨١		
Office Action Summary		Examiner		GOURRAUD ET /	AL.			
	•		Hassan Phillips		2151			
	The MAILING DATE of this communic	cation appe	•	sheet with the c		ldress		
Period for					on coponacion ac			
THE M - Extens after SI - If the p - If NO p - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION from the mailing date of this community (30) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community (30) eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply voly received by the Office later than three months af patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.13 unication.) days, a reply tutory period wi vill, by statute,	6(a). In no event, however within the statutory minin If apply and will expire SI cause the application to b	er, may a reply be tim num of thirty (30) days X (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this c O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	iy. ommunication.		
Status								
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on <i>17 Ma</i>	ay 2004.					
			action is non-final	•				
3) 🗌 S	,—							
C	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositio	n of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicatio	n Papers							
9) <u> </u>	he specification is objected to by the	Examiner						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
P	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority un	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a) 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority of Certified copies of the priority of Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation the the attached detailed Office actions	documents documents of the priori nal Bureau	have been receive have been receive ty documents have (PCT Rule 17.2(a	red. red in Application re been receive (a)).	on No d in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s	5)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) A) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
3) Informa	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F No(s)/Mail Date		5) 🔲 N		te atent Application (PT0	O-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to amendments received on May 17, 2004.

Oath/Declaration

1. The Oath/Declaration filed May 17, 2004 is adequate and complete. The examiner has therefore withdrawn the objection to the oath/declaration.

Claim Objections

1. After consideration of the amendments to claims 5 and 15, the examiner has withdrawn the objections to claims 5 and 15.

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed May 17, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On page 11, lines 26-36, Applicant argues that Stahl teaches an application program 110 consulting a local list 64, and transmitting individual requests for information 67a and 67b, for obtaining information from servers 112a, and 112b. More specifically, applicant argues that the teachings of Stahl fail to suggest:
 - a) Transmission of a list containing a variety of requested programs.

Examiner respectfully submits that Applicant has misinterpreted the prior art of record. The teachings of Stahl, in which the Applicant refers to, are just one of several

Application/Control Number: 09/682,839

Art Unit: 2151

methods taught by Stahl. Regarding item a), Stahl teaches transmission of a list containing a variety of requested programs on page 3, paragraph 32. Furthermore, particularly with reference to Fig. 7, and its associated description on page 6, paragraphs 71-73, Stahl teaches the request being received by the intermediate node (or service provider), and responsive to receipt of the request, the intermediate node determining the content providers storing the requested information.

In addition, the Examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is also the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art.

Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterated the need for Applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly.

Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 09/682,839

Art Unit: 2151

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (703) 305-8760. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/ 7/12/04

> ZARNI MAUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER